

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ABBOTT LABORATORIES, an Illinois corporation, FOURNIER INDUSTRIE ET SANTÉ, a French corporation, and LABORATOIRES FOURNIER S.A., a French corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, Inc.,
a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 02-1512 (KAJ)
(consolidated)

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, Inc.,
a Delaware corporation, and TEVA
PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRIES LTD.,
an Israeli corporation,

Counterclaim Plaintiffs,

v.

ABBOTT LABORATORIES, an Illinois corporation, FOURNIER INDUSTRIE ET SANTÉ, a French corporation, and LABORATOIRES FOURNIER, S.A., a French corporation,

Counterclaim Defendants.

ABBOTT LABORATORIES, an Illinois corporation, FOURNIER INDUSTRIE ET SANTÉ, a French corporation, and LABORATOIRES FOURNIER S.A., a French corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

IMPAX LABORATORIES, INC,
a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

Civil Action No.: 03-120-KAJ
(Consolidated)

IMPAX LABORATORIES, INC,
a Delaware corporation,

Counterclaim Plaintiffs,

v.

ABBOTT LABORATORIES, an Illinois
corporation, FOURNIER INDUSTRIE ET
SANTÉ, a French corporation, and
LABORATOIRES FOURNIER, S.A., a
French corporation,

Counterclaim Defendants.

IN RE TRICOR DIRECT PURCHASER
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

ALL ACTIONS

Civil Action No. 05-340 (KAJ)

(consolidated)

IN RE TRICOR INDIRECT PURCHASER
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

ALL ACTIONS

Civil Action No. 05-360 (KAJ)

(consolidated)

**DEFENDANTS' CONSOLIDATED OPENING BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF THEIR
CONSOLIDATED MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINTS**

Attorneys for Abbott Laboratories:

Mary B. Graham (I.D. #2256)
mgraham@mnat.com
MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL
1201 N. Market Street
P.O. Box 1347
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 658-9200

*Attorneys for Fournier Industrie et Santé, and
Laboratories Fournier S.A.:*

Frederick L. Cottrell, III (I.D. #2555)
Anne Shea Gaza (I.D. #4093)
cottrell@rlf.com
gaza@rlf.com
RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER
One Rodney Square
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 651-7700

Of Counsel:

William F. Cavanaugh, Jr.
Eugene M. Gelernter
Chad J. Peterman
Alexis A. Gander
PATTERSON, BELKNAP, WEBB TYLER LLP
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036-6710
(212) 336-2000

Of Counsel:

Steven C. Sunshine
Matthew P. Hendrickson
Maria M. DiMoscato
Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP
1201 F Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 862-2200

Timothy C. Bickham
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-1795
(202) 429-5517

Dated: October 19, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iii
STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	3
I Defendants' Fenofibrate Capsule Products	3
II. Defendants' First-Generation Tablets	4
III. Defendants' Second-Generation Tablets.....	6
IV. The Tablet Litigation.....	7
ARGUMENT	8
I. Legal Standard.....	8
II. Plaintiffs' Product Introduction Allegations Do Not State A Claim Under The Antitrust Laws	8
A. The Antitrust Laws Encourage New Product Development	9
B. Plaintiffs Product Introduction Allegations Do Not State An Antitrust Claim.	11
C. Abbott and Fournier Have No Duty to Maintain Discontinued Products in the Marketplace.....	14
D. Truthful Communications To The NDDF Service Do Not Establish Cognizable Antitrust Claims And Are Otherwise Protected By The First Amendment.	16
III. Plaintiffs' Allegations Of Wrongful Litigation Conduct Do Not State A Claim Under The Antitrust Laws.....	17
A. Defendants' Litigation Is Immunized From Antitrust Challenge As A Matter Of Law Under The <i>Noerr-Pennington</i> Doctrine.	17
1. The <i>Noerr-Pennington</i> Standard	17
B. The Tablet Litigations	18
1. This Court's Summary Judgment Rulings Demonstrate the Objective Reasonableness of the Tablet Litigation.....	19
2. Product Testing.....	20
3. Inequitable Conduct	21
4. The Dismissal of the Tablet Litigation Patent Claims.....	23
C. The Capsule Litigations	24
D. The Orange Book Listing Does Not State A Claim	25
IV. Fournier's and Abbott's Litigation Conduct Has Not Caused Antitrust Injury to Plaintiffs.	26

A.	Teva’s <i>Walker Process</i> Claims Fails to Allege Antitrust Injury	26
B.	Impax’s <i>Walker Process</i> Claims Fail to Allege Antitrust Injury.	28
C.	The Remaining Plaintiffs Have Not Adequately Pled Antitrust Injury.....	29
V.	Plaintiffs’ “Overall Scheme” Allegation Fails To State A Claim.	29
VI.	Plaintiffs’ Allegations Of Tortious Interference Fail To State A Claim.	30
VII.	Plaintiffs Improperly Conflate Allegations Against Abbott and Fournier	31
A.	Plaintiffs’ Antitrust Claims Based on Inequitable Conduct or <i>Walker Process</i> Fraud Against Abbott Should be Dismissed.	32
1.	Teva’s <i>Walker Process</i> Counterclaims Against Abbott Are Not Pled With Sufficient Particularity and Should Be Dismissed	32
2.	Impax’s <i>Walker Process</i> Counterclaims Should Be Dismissed Against Abbott Because They Fail to State a Claim and, in the Alternative, Because They Are Not Pled With Sufficient Particularity	35
3.	The Antitrust Plaintiffs’ Inequitable Conduct Allegations Against Abbott Should Be Dismissed.....	36
B.	Plaintiffs’ Antitrust Claims Based on Marketing Conduct Against Fournier Should Be Dismissed.....	36
VIII.	The State Law Claims Should Be Dismissed.....	38
	Conclusion.....	39

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**PAGE(S)****Cases**

<i>Abbott Labs. v. Impax Labs., Inc.</i> , No. 03-120-KAJ (consolidated), 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8279 (D. Del. May 6, 2005).....	7
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Novopharm Ltd.</i> , No. 00 C 2141, 00 C 5094, 01 C 1914, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4659 (N.D. Ill. March 20, 2002), <i>aff'd</i> , 323 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	4
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Teva Pharm., Inc.</i> , No. 02-1512-KAJ (consolidated), 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8285 (D. Del. May 6, 2005).....	7, 20
<i>Argus Chem. Corp. v. Fibre Glass-Evercoat Co., Inc.</i> , 812 F.2d 1381 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	22
<i>Armstrong Surgical Ctr., Inc. v. Armstrong County Mem'l Hosp.</i> , 185 F.3d 154 (3d Cir. 1999)	18
<i>Atlantic Richfield Co. v. USA Petroleum Co.</i> , 495 U.S. 328 (1990).....	26
<i>Axis S.p.A. v. Micafil, Inc.</i> , 870 F.2d 1105 (6th Cir. 1989).....	27
<i>Berkey Photo, Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co.</i> , 603 F.2d 263 (2d Cir. 1979).....	9, 11, 13, 14
<i>Bourns, Inc. v. Raychem Corp.</i> , 331 F.3d 704 (9th Cir. 2003)	23
<i>Brown Shoe Co. v. United States</i> , 370 U.S. 294 (1962)	26
<i>Brunswick Corp. v. Pueblo Bowl-O-Mat</i> , 429 U.S. 477 (1977)	26, 28, 29
<i>C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys., Inc.</i> , 157 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir.), <i>reh'g en banc denied</i> , 161 F.3d 1380 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	10
<i>California Computer Prods., Inc. v. IBM</i> , 613 F.2d 727 (9th Cir. 1979)	10
<i>City of Pittsburgh v. West Penn Power Co.</i> , 147 F.3d 256 (3d Cir. 1998).....	27
<i>Coastal States Mktg, Inc. v. Hunt</i> , 694 F.2d 1358 (5th Cir. 1983)	30
<i>Cont'l Paper Bag v. Eastern Paper Bag</i> , 210 U.S. 405 (1908).....	15
<i>Cont'l T.V., Inc. v. GTE Sylvania Inc.</i> , 433 U.S. 36 (1977)	16
<i>Covad Commc'n Co. v. Bell Atl. Corp.</i> , 398 F.3d 666 (D.C. Cir. 2005)	24-25
<i>Critical-Vac Filtration Corp. v. Minuteman Int'l, Inc.</i> , 233 F.3d 697 (2d Cir. 2000), <i>cert. denied</i> , 532 U.S. 1019 (2001)	24

<i>David L. Aldridge Co. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 995 F. Supp. 728 (S.D. Tex. 1998)	9
<i>DeBonaventura v. Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co.</i> , 428 A.2d 1151 (Del. 1981)	30, 31
<i>Doug Grant, Inc. v. Greate Bay Casino Corp.</i> , 232 F.3d 173 (3d Cir. 2000)	8
<i>E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Berkley and Co., Inc.</i> , 620 F.2d 1247 (8th Cir. 1980)	22
<i>EMC Corp. v. Storage Tech. Corp.</i> , 921 F. Supp. 1261 (D. Del. 1996)	35
<i>Eon Labs., Inc. v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.</i> , 298 F. Supp. 2d 175 (D. Mass. 2003)	38
<i>Foremost Pro Color, Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co.</i> , 703 F.2d 534 (9th Cir. 1983)	9, 10
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. Regents of the Univ. of Cal.</i> , 143 F.3d 1446 (Fed. Cir. 1998), <i>cert.</i> <i>granted, judgment vacated and remanded on other grounds</i> , 527 U.S. 1031 (1999)	24
<i>Gen-Probe, Inc. v. Amoco Corp., Inc.</i> , 926 F. Supp. 948 (S.D. Cal. 1996)	20
<i>Golan v. Pingel Enter.</i> , 310 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	37
<i>Harris Custom Builders v. Hoffmeyer</i> , 834 F. Supp. 256 (N.D. Ill. 1993)	20
<i>Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. Universal Avionics Sys. Corp.</i> , 343 F. Supp. 2d 272 (D. Del. 2004)	18
<i>Ibanez v. Florida Dep't of Bus. and Prof. Reg., Bd. of Accountancy</i> , 512 U.S. 136 (1994)	16
<i>ILC Peripherals Leasing Corp. v. IBM</i> , 458 F. Supp. 423 (N.D. Cal. 1978)	10
<i>In Re Burlington Coat Factory Sec. Litig.</i> , 114 F.3d 1410 (3rd Cir. 1997)	34
<i>In re Home Health Corp. of Am. Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 98-834, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1230 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 28, 1999)	33
<i>In re Indep. Serv. Orgs. Antitrust Litig.</i> , 989 F. Supp. 1131 (D. Kan. 1997)	30
<i>In re Indian Palms Assocs., Ltd.</i> , 61 F.3d 197 (3d Cir. 1995)	8
<i>In re Orthopedic Bone Screw Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 193 F.3d 781 (3d Cir. 1999)	25
<i>In re Remeron</i> , 335 F. Supp. 2d 522 (D.N.J. 2004)	23
<i>Jordan v. Fox, Rothschild, O'Brien & Frankel</i> , 20 F.3d 1250 (3d Cir. 1994)	35
<i>Kirkwood Kin Corp. v. Dunkin' Donuts, Inc.</i> , Civ. A. No. 94C-03-189, 1995 WL 411319 (Del. Super. Ct. June 30, 1995)	31
<i>LePage's Inc. v. 3M</i> , 324 F.3d 141 (3d Cir. 2003)	29

<i>Lucent Info. Mgmt. v. Lucent Techs.</i> , 5 F. Supp. 2d 238 (D. Del. 1998)	31
<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i> , 504 U.S. 555 (1992)	28
<i>Medtronic Minimed Inc. v. Smiths Med. MD Inc.</i> , 371 F. Supp. 2d 578 (D. Del. 2005)	12, 14
<i>Miller Pipeline Corp. v. British Gas PLC</i> , 69 F. Supp. 2d 1129 (S.D. Ind. 1999)	18, 25
<i>Morris Commc'n Corp. v. PGA Tour, Inc.</i> , 364 F.3d 1288 (11th Cir. 2004)	16
<i>Mountain View Pharm. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 630 F.2d 1383 (10th Cir. 1980)	37
<i>Mylan Pharm., Inc. v. Thompson</i> , 268 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001), <i>cert. denied</i> , 537 U.S. 941 (2002)	25
<i>Nobelpharma AB v. Implant Innovations, Inc.</i> , 141 F. 3d 1059 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	22, 32-33
<i>Oliveira v. Amoco Oil Co.</i> , 776 N.E.2d 151 (Ill. 2002)	38-39
<i>Olympia Equip. Leasing Co. v. Western Union Tel. Co.</i> , 797 F.2d 370 (7th Cir. 1986)	14, 15
<i>Orr v. BHR, Inc.</i> , 4 Fed. Appx. 647 (10th Cir. 2001)	37
<i>Pennpac Int'l, Inc. v. Rotronics Mfg., Inc.</i> , No. 99-2890, 2001 WL 569264 (E.D. Pa. May 25, 2001)	21
<i>Pension Benefit Guar. Corp. v. White Consol. Indus., Inc.</i> , 998 F.2d 1192 (3d Cir. 1993)	6
<i>Plaum v. Jefferson Pilot Fin. Ins. Co.</i> , No. Civ.A.04-4597, 2004 WL 2980415 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2004)	38
<i>Professional Real Estate Investors, Inc. v. Columbia Pictures Indus., Inc.</i> , 508 U.S. 49 (1993)	17-19, 24-25
<i>Q-Pharma Inc. v. Andrew Jergens Co.</i> , 360 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	20-21
<i>Sandvik AB v. Advent Int'l Corp.</i> , 83 F. Supp. 2d 442 (D. Del. 1999), <i>aff'd</i> 220 F.3d 99 (3rd Cir. 2000)	33
<i>SCM Corp. v. Xerox Corp.</i> , 645 F.2d 1195, <i>cert. denied</i> , 455 U.S. 1016 (1982) (2d Cir. 1981)	30
<i>Seagood Trading Corp. v. Jerrico, Inc.</i> , 924 F.2d 1555 (11th Cir. 1991)	16
<i>Sickles v. Cabot Corp.</i> , 877 A.2d 267 (N.J. Super. Ct. App. Div. 2005)	38
<i>SSIH Equipment S.A. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 718 F.2d 365 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	27-28

<i>Telex Corp. v. IBM</i> , 367 F. Supp. 258 (N.D. Okla. 1973), <i>rev'd on other grounds</i> , 510 F.2d 894 (10th Cir. 1975)	10
<i>Transamerica Computer Co. v. IBM Corp.</i> , 481 F. Supp. 965 (N.D. Cal. 1979, <i>aff'd</i> , 698 F.2d 1377 (9th Cir. 1983)	9-10, 11
<i>Travelers Indem. Co. of Ill. v. Hardwicke</i> , 339 F. Supp. 2d 1127 (D. Colo. 2004).....	38
<i>Twin City Bakery Workers & Welfare Fund v. Astra Aktiebolag</i> , 207 F. Supp. 2d 221 (S.D.N.Y. 2002)	19-20
<i>U.S. v. Grinnell Corp.</i> , 384 U.S. 563 (1966)	29
<i>United Mine Workers of Am. v. Pennington</i> , 381 U.S. 657 (1965)	29-30
<i>Unitherm Food Sys., Inc. v. Swift-Eckrich, Inc.</i> , 375 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2004), <i>cert. granted in part</i> , 125 S. Ct. 1396 (2005), <i>cert. denied in part</i> , 125 S. Ct. 1399 (2005)	32, 33
<i>Verizon Commc'n v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP</i> , 540 U.S. 398 (2004).....	9, 14, 16
<i>Walker Process Equip., Inc. v. Food Mach. & Chem. Corp.</i> , 382 U.S. 172 (1965).....	2
<i>Weiss v. Leewards Creative Crafts, Inc.</i> , Civ. A. No. 12384, 1993 WL 155493 (Del. Ch. Apr. 29, 1993), <i>aff'd</i> , 633 A.2d 32 (Del. 1993)	31
<i>Werner v. Werner</i> , 267 F.3d 288 (3d Cir. 2001).....	8

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 271(d)(4)	15
-----------------------------	----

Other Authorities

Herbert Hovenkamp, <i>Frank E. Strong Law Forum Lecture: The Monopolization Offense</i> , 61 Ohio St. L.J. 1035 (2000).....	9, 13
Herbert Hovenkamp, <i>Post-Chicago Antitrust – A Review and Critique</i> , 2001 Colum. Bus. L. Rev. 257 (2001)	11
Justice Stephen Breyer, <i>In Memoriam: Phillip E. Areeda</i> , 109 Harv. L. Rev. 889 (1996).	11
Phillip E. Areeda & Herbert Hovenkamp, <i>Antitrust Law: An Analysis of Antitrust Principles and Their Application</i> (2000 & 2005 Supp.).....	9, 10, 13, 14